



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
[www.uspto.gov](http://www.uspto.gov)

| APPLICATION NO.               | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. | CONFIRMATION NO. |
|-------------------------------|-------------|----------------------|---------------------|------------------|
| 10/784,891                    | 02/24/2004  | Hirotomi Nemoto      | 107348-00393        | 9987             |
| 4372                          | 7590        | 06/27/2007           | EXAMINER            |                  |
| ARENT FOX PLLC                |             |                      | EPPS, TODD MICHAEL  |                  |
| 1050 CONNECTICUT AVENUE, N.W. |             |                      | ART UNIT            | PAPER NUMBER     |
| SUITE 400                     |             |                      | 3632                |                  |
| WASHINGTON, DC 20036          |             |                      |                     |                  |
| MAIL DATE                     |             | DELIVERY MODE        |                     |                  |
| 06/27/2007                    |             | PAPER                |                     |                  |

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

|                          |                        |                     |
|--------------------------|------------------------|---------------------|
| <b>Interview Summary</b> | <b>Application No.</b> | <b>Applicant(s)</b> |
|                          | 10/784,891             | NEMOTO ET AL.       |
|                          | <b>Examiner</b>        | <b>Art Unit</b>     |
|                          | Todd M. Epps           | 3632                |

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

- (1) Todd M. Epps. (3) Joey Wujciak (primary).  
 (2) Michelle Connell (attorney). (4) \_\_\_\_\_.

Date of Interview: 18 June 2007.

Type: a) Telephonic b) Video Conference  
 c) Personal [copy given to: 1) applicant 2) applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) Yes e) No.  
 If Yes, brief description: \_\_\_\_\_.

Claim(s) discussed: 1 and 11.

Identification of prior art discussed: U.S. Pat #6,422,546 to Nemoto et al. and U.S. Pat #6,406,010 to Yano et al.

Agreement with respect to the claims f) was reached. g) was not reached. h) N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: See Continuation Sheet.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN A NON-EXTENDABLE PERIOD OF THE LONGER OF ONE MONTH OR THIRTY DAYS FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.

Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an attachment to a signed Office action.

  
 Examiner's signature, if required

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: Applicant's attorney discussed the distinguishing features of the present invention. Applicant is requesting reconsideration of independent claims 1 and 11 as being rejected 103 by the Nemoto's reference in view of Yano's reference. The attorney pointed out that Yano's reference do not teach the limitation of "wherein operation of said active anti-vibration supporting device is prohibited when an abnormality in an operational state of the engine is detected." The Examiner pointed out that Yano's reference teach the concept of wherein operation of a device is prohibited when an abnormality in an operational state of the engine is detected. Clearly, no agreement was reached on this matter. In response to the previous office action, applicant's attorney will file an appeal and present all arguments presented in this interview at that time.